



*Research for People and the Planet*

**To:** Paul Dabbs, DWR  
Kamyar Guivetchi, DWR  
Linda Adams, DWR

**From:** Dr. Peter H. Gleick, Pacific Institute

**Date:** December 16, 2003

### **Comments on Chapter 1**

Below please find some comments and suggested rewording of Chapter 1. The recent rewrite has introduced some serious problems, reminiscent of previous B160s, and going back on over two years of discussion with the Public Advisory Committee.

These comments are directed at text that misleadingly suggests that future urban demand will go up 2 to 3 million acre-feet by 2030. This is only one possible scenario out of the several we discussed, and it inadequately presents the range of possibilities. Another possibility is a **decrease** in urban demand. The current text is not what we agreed to in the Advisory Committee meetings and will mislead the readers. The whole point of the extensive discussion about multiple scenarios was to show the range of uncertainty. If a single number is put in, this B160 will be no better than previous ones. If this range is left in, it **MUST** have a footnote that states “This single scenario assumes no additional efforts at conservation and efficiency and no new technological improvements in water use.”

---

**Page 1. This clause is misleading and perpetuates the myth that demand is fixed in form and nature. Please replace it.**

**Delete (p.1)**

California has resources to meet many, but not all, of its water demands with its present population (see table).

**Replace with (p.1)**

Given the current patterns of water use, California has sufficient resources to meet many, but not all, of its water demands with its present population (see table).

---

**Page 2: Correct the Table on 2030 Scenarios**

The “Additional Demands” for urban water use in Table 1 under “2030 Scenarios” should be - 3 to 3 maf, NOT 2 to 3 maf.

The recent report, “Waste Not, Want Not” on California urban water conservation potential showed the possibility of cost-effective **reductions** in urban water demand of 2 million acre-feet.<sup>1</sup>

**Page 2: Replace the last paragraph**

**Delete (p.2)**

“... This includes an additional 2 million - 3 million acre-feet for a projected population growth of 17 million more Californians (53 million people by 2030);...]

**Replace with (p.2)**

“...This includes a range of -3 to 3 million acre-feet for a projected population growth of 17 million more Californians...”

---

**Page 19. The following should be re-written to eliminate the errors and misinterpretations that could come from the current text.**

**Delete (p.19)**

[The recommended actions in this Water Plan Update were developed to address and offset the challenges facing California water resources, reducing the risks associated with planning for the future, and providing the additional estimated 2030 water demand of ? million - ? million acre-feet. These challenges and risks would continue and worsen with inaction or delayed realization of the Water Plan on the part of the State, federal government and local agencies and governments. By not meeting these additional demands, groundwater overdraft could worsen, aquatic ecosystems could be further stressed, and California’s economy and agricultural industry could suffer.]

**Replace with (p.19)**

The recommended actions in this Water Plan Update were developed to address and offset the challenges facing California water resources and to reduce the

---

<sup>1</sup> Gleick et al. 2003. “Waste Not, Want Not: The Potential for Urban Water Conservation in California.” Pacific Institute, Oakland, CA. available at [www.pacinst.org](http://www.pacinst.org)



**PACIFIC  
INSTITUTE**

*Research for People and the Planet*

risks associated with uncertainty about future water supplies and demands. These challenges and risks would continue and worsen with inaction or delayed realization of the Water Plan on the part of the State, federal government and local agencies and governments. Unless action is taken, groundwater overdraft could worsen, aquatic ecosystems could be further stressed, and California's economy and agricultural industry could suffer.